

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0065951 of Liston et al. ("Liston") in view of a journal article titled "Development of Process Visualization Systems: An Object-Oriented Approach," by Szirmay-Kalos ("Szirmay-Kalos").

Claims 1-21 are currently pending, with claims 1, 15, 18, and 21 being independent. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liston in view of Szirmay-Kalos. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1-21.

"The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. . . . [R]ejections on obviousness cannot be sustained with mere conclusory statements." M.P.E.P. § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (Sept. 2007) (internal citation and inner quotation omitted). "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.01(III) (emphasis in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

original). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious.” M.P.E.P. § 2141.02(I) (emphases in original).

“[T]he framework for objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966). . . . The factual inquiries . . . [include determining the scope and content of the prior art and] . . . [a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2141(II). “Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.” M.P.E.P. § 2141(III).

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, “deriv[ing] one or more data dependency relationships from the data mappings, each data dependency relationship being directed from a first controller to a second controller and from the second controller to one model, one data dependency relationship being derived whenever there is at least one data mapping between the first controller and the second controller and between the second controller and the model, and visualiz[ing] the data dependency relationships directed from the first controller to the second controller and from the second controller to the model by displaying a link for each of one or more data dependency relationships, each link showing a direction of data dependency.” Liston and Szirmay-Kalos, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these recited elements.

The Examiner correctly observed that Liston does not teach “each data dependency relationship being directed from a first controller to a second controller and from the second controller to one model, one data dependency relationship being derived whenever there is at least one data mapping between the first controller and the second controller and the second controller and between the second controller and the model.” Office Action at 3. The Examiner attempted to cure these deficiencies by relying on Szirmay-Kalos. However, Szirmay-Kalos does not teach or suggest any “data dependency relationship being directed from a first controller to a second controller and from the second controller to one model,” as recited in independent claim 1. Instead, Szirmay-Kalos discloses an association, aggregation, or specialization relationship in object oriented modeling/development. For example, FIG. 4 of Szirmay-Kalos shows a simple line or a line with a diamond in one end and a filled circle in the other end to describe a relationship between two entities. Szirmay-Kalos, FIG. 4. This line, however, does not represent a data dependency relationship as recited in claim 1. The Szirmay-Kalos provides that “[a] simple line between two classes show association. The diamond symbol on the line defines aggregation. The filled circles define one-to-many aggregation. Finally the lines containing triangles represent specialization.” Szirmay-Kalos, page 6, paragraph 4. Association, aggregation, or specialization does not represent a data dependency relationship between controllers as recited in claim 1. Thus, Szirmay-Kalos does not cure the deficiencies of Liston. Nor does it teach or suggest “each data dependency relationship being directed from a first controller to a second controller and from the second controller to one model, one data dependency relationship being derived whenever there is at least one data mapping between the first

controller and the second controller and the second controller and between the second controller and the model,” as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, as the Examiner correctly observed, Liston does not teach “visualiz[ing] the data dependency relationships by displaying a link for each of one or more data dependency relationships, each link showing a direction of data dependency.” Office Action at 4. The Examiner attempted to cure these deficiencies by relying on Szirmay-Kalos. However, as explained above, Szirmay-Kalos does not teach or suggest “each data dependency relationship being directed from a first controller to a second controller and from the second controller to one model,” as recited in independent claim 1. Thus, Szirmay-Kalos also fails to teach or suggest “visualiz[ing] the data dependency relationships by displaying a link for each of one or more data dependency relationships, each link showing a direction of data dependency,” as recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the limited disclosure of the Szirmay-Kalos reference noted above, the Office Action has neither properly determined the scope and content of the prior art nor properly ascertained the differences between the prior art and the invention of claim 1. Moreover, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of the references to achieve the claimed combinations. Thus, the Office Action has failed to clearly articulate a reason why claim 1 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the prior art. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1 and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) must be withdrawn.

Independent claims 15, 18, and 21, although of different scope, recite features that are similar to the features recited in independent claim 1. For reasons at least similar to the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to independent claims 15, 18, and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of claims 15, 18, and 21 based on Liston and Szirmay-Kalos.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 2-14, 16, 17, 19, and 20 based on Liston and Szirmay-Kalos.

## II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By. 

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz  
Reg. No. 36,743

Dated: August 28, 2008